

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 2-4 and 6-9 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 13 have been amended. Claims 12 and 14-21 have been canceled. New claims 22-27 have been added.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hudgens *et al.* (US 4,737,379). Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks Examiner Brunsman for the telephonic interview conducted on March 12, 2004. Differences between the pending claims and the Hudgens *et al.* reference were discussed. In particular, it was noted that the only silicon-containing components of a *multilayer* coating disclosed by Hudgens *et al.* were SiO_x and SiN_z. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment to claim 1, namely to recite a *multilayer* coating in which each layer of the coating comprises a composition as previously recited in claim 1, with the exclusion of SiO_x and SiN_z, would be sufficient to overcome the cited reference. The Examiner also consented to enter new claims drawn to a coating for a carbon-containing component, the coating having the composition as previously recited in claim 1, and wherein the carbon-containing component comprises a carbon-carbon (C-C) composite material.

Hudgens *et al.* (US 4,737,379)

Hudgens *et al.* discloses plasma deposited coatings and a low temperature method of depositing a substantially hydrogen free or controlled hydrogen content multi-element alloy film on a substrate, such as an organic

polymeric substrate, as used in lenses, transparent articles, and the like.

With respect to amended claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13, Hudgens *et al.* does not disclose nor suggest a multilayer coating having the composition as recited in claims 1 and 13 as amended. Claims 5, 10, and 11 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13 with respect to Hudgens *et al.*

With respect to new claims 22-27, Hudgens *et al.* does not disclose nor suggest a Si-containing coating for a carbon-carbon composite material. The method of Hudgens *et al.* is disclosed as a low temperature coating method for coating organic polymer substrates at temperatures below those at which the substrate degrades, e.g., typically 170° C (see, for example, col. 10 lines 24-32).

In contrast to the cited reference, carbon-carbon composites, as recited in new claims 22-27, are known as high temperature materials which may retain their properties at temperatures of about 2000° C.

Applicant submits that Hudgens *et al.* does not anticipate, nor render obvious, the specific combination recited in amended claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13, and new claims 22-27.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112

Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated that there was no basis in the specification as

filed for the amendment made to claims 1 and 13 in applicant's response of November 24, 2003.

Without agreeing to the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 13 to delete the language added thereto by amendment in applicant's response of November 24, 2003. Thus, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is rendered moot.

Support for amended claims

Support for amendment to claim 1 can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 13-14; page 6, lines 4-6; and page 7, lines 17-18 of the specification.

Support for amendment to claim 5 can be found, for example, at page 5, lines 10-15; and page 8, lines 21-22 of the specification.

Support for amendment to claim 10 can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 22-24 of the specification.

Support for amendment to claim 13 can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 13-14; page 6, lines 4-6; and page 7, lines 17-18 of the specification.

Support for new claims

Support for new claim 22 can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 2-10; page 5, lines 10-15; and page 8, lines 21-22 of the specification.

Support for new claim 23 can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 13-14; page 6, lines 4-6; and page 7, lines 17-18 of the specification.

Support for new claim 24 can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 2-10 of the specification.

Support for new claim 25 can be found, for example, at page 10, lines 6-14 of the specification.

Support for new claim 26 can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 22-24 of the specification.

Support for new claim 27 can be found, for example, at page 8, lines 13-18 of the specification.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Office Action with respect to claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 13 are requested. Applicant submits that claims 1-27 are now in condition for allowance.

In the event that the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Michael A. Shimokaji
Attorney Reg. No. 32,303

Serial No. 09/828,048

Page 10

Honeywell International, Inc.
Law Dept. AB2
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806
(310) 512-4886
Attn: Oral Caglar

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on

4/6/04

Michael A. Shimokaji, Reg. No. 32,303

